

*Amendment under 37CFR 1.114
U.S. App. Ser. No. 09/921,167
Attorney Docket: 056450/0119019*

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-22, and 24-40 are pending in the application. Claims 2 and 23 have been cancelled. In the Office Action mailed July 25, 2005 and the Advisory Action mailed October 27, 2005, claims 1, 3-22, and 24-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US2004/0171396 (Carey et al, hereinafter "Carey").

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1, 3-22, and 24-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carey. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. In order to more particularly call out and define the Applicants' invention, the Applicants have herein amended claims 1 and 22 in order to clarify the method by which the Applicants' invention reformats the message routing information while leaving the message body unchanged. Consequently, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 22 to call out that the step of reformatting the associated message routing information is performed by the steps of translating the receiver identifier to a destination address that conforms to the mobile carrier addressing format type; placing the destination address into a reformatted message that has a structure that conforms to the mobile carrier format type; and placing the message body unchanged into the reformatted message in a manner that conforms to the mobile carrier format type. Support for these amendments is found at least at paragraphs [0069], [0080], [0105], [0107]-[0109], and [0129]-[0186] of the published application and in Figs. 5-7. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The Applicants believe that the Applicant's step of reformatting is not taught or suggested by Carey, by any of the other references of record, or by any other prior art. The claimed method of routing a message from a sender in a first digital mobile network to an intended receiver in a second different digital mobile network is therefore not shown in the art of record nor in any other prior art. Claims 1 and 22 are therefore not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Carey, by any other reference of record, or by any other prior art, whether taken alone or in combination. Allowance of claims 1 and 22, as amended, is therefore respectfully requested.

*Amendment under 37CFR 1.114
U.S. App. Ser. No. 09/921,167
Attorney Docket: 056450/0119019*

Because claims 3-21 depend from independent claim 1, which is in condition for allowance, the Applicants believe that claims 3- 21 are also in condition for allowance. Similarly, because claims 24-40 depend from independent claim 22, which is in condition for allowance, the applicants believe that claims 24- 40 are also in condition for allowance. Allowance of claims 3- 21 and 24-40 is therefore respectfully requested.


II. Conclusion

Claims 1 and 22 have been amended. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-22, and 24-40 are now in condition for allowance. For this reason, and in view of the foregoing arguments, the Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain any unresolved issues, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Norma E. Henderson, Applicants' Attorney, at 603-225-4334, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,
Hinckley, Allen & Snyder LLP

January 25, 2006

Date

By: 
Norma E. Henderson
Attorney/Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,219

Norma E. Henderson, Esq.
Hinckley, Allen & Snyder LLP
43 North Main Street, 2nd floor
Concord, NH 03301-4934
Tel: 603-225-4334
Fax: 603-224-8350